2: Fortes E-5 (1934-1937) 1945
FE11 Tallensi FE11

of the clan. They regularly attend sacrifices and ceremonies at Gbizug as their forefathers did, and continue to perform the duties and accept the privileges of close *sunzɔp* of Gbizug. But they are uneasy, the more so as the Gbizug tɛndaana never loses an opportunity of haranguing them, at ceremonies, about the disgraceful conduct of their tɛndaana. For a short while the inescapable demands of ritual collaboration brought the two tɛndaanas together again, when the Gbeog tɛndaana had to perform the principal rites at the installation of the new Gbizug tɛndaana. But soon afterwards their dispute revived again. It is, as elders of related clans declared, an insoluble dispute. Both tɛndaanas are right, they say. The Gbizug tɛndaana is going by 'what used to be (*dɛn daa a siem*)', the Gbeog tɛndaana by 'what is now (*dɛn a siem zinala*)'. It is a problem of adjusting the equilibrium of the clan to changes in the segmentary relationship of its component lineages. One day, it is said, there will be a Gbizug tɛndaana who will accept the present position. Then the two tɛndaanas will become reconciled and the quarrel will cease.

As this story shows, intra-clan conflicts dislocate the routine of co-operation and reciprocity and lead to anomalies in customary modes of conduct. Yinyɛla's refusal to co-operate in the affairs of Tɔŋ-Puhug led to many embarrassing situations; as when two men who were not members of Yinyɛla's segment came to assist his (classificatory) grandson with his house-building, in accordance with normal custom, and were publicly rebuked for this by the head of their family. Dislocation of the normal scheme of ritual and ceremonial co-operation in the ancestor cult and in public ceremonies such as funerals is particularly disturbing. It serves to focus attention on the interpretation of actions that damage lineage solidarity as offences against the ancestors. Public opinion, the point of view of the majority, which always favours the greater solidarity as the source of stability and normality in corporate relations, becomes critical. In due time one of the opponents of the dispute dies; and according to custom the mystical cause of his death is sought by divination. The technique and social setting of the divining session make it a reflection of public sentiment. The diviner brings the simmering conflict in the lineage into the open and relates the death to it. His verdict, coming ostensibly from the ancestors, concludes with commands from them to put the situation right by means of sacrifices and a ritual reconciliation. This is the commonest way in which the ancestor cult emerges as a sanction of reintegration in the lineage or clan. But it presupposes the existence of ritual ties and common ritual obligations among lineage and clan kin; and it comes as the culmination of a social reaction to the anomalies arising from intra-clan conflicts.

We have space only for one illustrative case history. Many years ago Gbalɔg of Tɔŋ-Puhug insulted the then Chief of Tongo. The chief pronounced a curse on him; and rather than apologize Gbalɔg went to settle in one of the peripheral settlements taking his younger sons with him. His oldest son, Nangbeog, dissociating himself from his father, stayed behind at Tongo. Years passed. There was a new Chief of Tongo. Yet Gbalɔg remained unrepentant. In 1937 he died, a very old man, boasting that after all he had got the better of the chiefs of Tongo. But the diviner revealed that the ancestors had caused him to die because of